



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,673	07/15/2003	Jerome O. Blomberg	32275/0004	9646

30983 7590 05/08/2006

MCDONOUGH, HOLLAND & ALLEN
555 CAPITOL MALL
9TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

EXAMINER

CANFIELD, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,673

Applicant(s)

BLOMBERG, JEROME O.

Examiner

Robert J. Canfield

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-27, 29-42 and 44-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-27, 29-42 and 44-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed 03/27/06. Claims 25-27, 29-42 and 44-59 are pending. Claims 1-24, 28 and 43 have been canceled.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the corrugation having an A-frame shape (claims 48 and 59) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3635

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 25-27, 29-42, 44-48, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed percentages of the surface area of the corrugations capable of transmitting sunlight and the 20 degree angle of incidence are not supported by the specification as originally filed and are considered new matter.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 48 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what an A-frame shaped corrugation is.

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 3635

8. Claims 25-27, 29-42 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,236,350 to Hasselback.

Hasselbach provides a rectangular, plastic member 14. As the device is a greenhouse it inherently is capable of allowing sunlight there through and as such meets the limitations of both a window and a skylight. Member 14 having a main body portion, which is arched or V-shaped as shown in figure 3. The material itself is inherently prismatic. Figure 2 shows the apex length being shorter than the base length. The end portions 31 and 32 are sloped and have a planar portion provided with at least one corrugation. Generally sinusoidal, semi-hexagonally shaped (as shown in figures 5 and 7) corrugations 34 are provided perpendicular to the longitudinal axis. They are angled and capable of being positioned/oriented perpendicular to sunlight having a low angle of incidence and transmitting sunlight of any angle of incidence. An attachment flange at approximately 32' is provided which makes the cover as capable of being attached to the roof of building as applicant's device. As to claim 36, the method of manufacture is not required to meet a product claim.

9. Claims 49-51 and 53-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,236,350 to Hasselback.

Hasselback provides each of the elements of these claims as noted above except for specifying that the slope of the end portions toward the apex is at

Art Unit: 3635

angle of between about 15 and 85 degrees relative to the base, between about 25 and 75 degrees or between about 35 and about 65 degrees.

To have made the angle of sidewalls slope relative to the base in the claimed ranges would have been an obvious choice of design at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious because Hasselback recites at column 3, line 7 that the end walls slope upwardly and slightly inwardly. This in combination with the angle of the slope illustrated within the figures would suggest at the least the a slope of about 65 degrees to about 85 degrees relative to the base which would meet the claimed ranges.

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3635

11. Claims 25-27, 29-39, 41, 42, 44-47, and 49-58 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. D 489,462. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the drawing which are the claim of the design patent show each of the claimed elements except that the skylight is formed from a light-transmitting plastic. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art that the skylight of the design patent could have been made from light-transmitting plastic because plastic is well known for its use in windows and skylights for its inherent material properties such as ease of manufacturing into various shapes and light weight. When made of light-transmitting plastic the skylight would inherently be capable of transmitting sunlight at any angle of incidence.

12. Applicant's argument that Hasselback is not capable of transmitting sunlight of low angle of incidence is not found persuasive. The top 14 of Hasselback is inherently capable of transmitting sunlight of any angle of incidence as the device is a greenhouse and must transmit sunlight to allow for plant germination and growth.

As previously noted Applicant's argument that Hasselback is nonanalogous art, as it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention, is not germane to a 35 USC 102(b) anticipatory rejection. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3635

2131.05. Applicant's argument that Hasselback does not teach angling the side walls is not found persuasive as noted in the above rejection Hasselback teaches a slight slope.

In response to applicant's arguments that Hassleback is not a building skylight, a preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

In response to applicant's argument that Hasselback is not adapted to be attached to the roof of a building, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The flange 32' of Hassleback is as capable of being attached to the roof of a building as the flange of applicant's invention.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Art Unit: 3635

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert J. Canfield whose telephone number is 571-272-6840. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached on 571-272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert J Canfield
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3635

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'RJC', written over the printed name and title of the examiner.

05/03/06